

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

AMERICAN STRATEGIC INSURANCE
CORP, a foreign insurer,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JACOB JACKSON, individually, JACOB
JACKSON and STACY JACKSON, husband
and wife, INSPIRIT ATHLETICS, INC, a
Washington For-Profit Corporation, d.b.a.,
STERLING ATHLETICS, SUMNER-
BONNEY LAKE SCHOOL DISTRICT, a
Municipal Corporation, JOHN DOE 1,
individually, JOHN DOE 2, individually,
JANE DOE 1, individually, JOHN DOE 3,
individually, JOHN DOE 4, individually, and
JANE DOE 2, individually, JANE DOE 20, as
Guardian ad Litem for JOHN DOE 20, a
minor, and, JANE DOE 20 and JOHN DOE
21, wife and husband,

Defendants.

No. 3:23-CV-5461-RJB

**ORDER GRANTING AMENDED
MOTION TO ENTER FINAL
JUDGMENT**

Having considered Plaintiff's Amended Motion to Enter Final Judgment, and being fully
advised, that motion (Dkt. 85) is GRANTED.

Having further considered the pleadings filed regarding Plaintiff American Strategic
Insurance Corp.'s ("ASIC") Motions for Summary Judgment (Dkts. 38-45 & 53-56), the Orders

1 Granting the Motions for Summary Judgment (Dkts. 46 & 57), and Plaintiff's Amended Motion
2 to Enter Final Judgment (Dkt. 85), the Court makes the following Findings of Facts and
3 Conclusions of Law and ORDERS:

4 1. Plaintiff ASIC's Motions for Summary Judgment (Dkts. 38 & 53) are
5 GRANTED. The Court finds and concludes that Plaintiff does not owe a duty to defend or duty
6 to indemnify Defendant Jacob Jackson for the claims asserted against him in the underlying
7 lawsuits: (1) *John Doe 1, et al. v. Inspirit Athletics, Inc., et al.*, Pierce County Superior Court
8 Case No. 22-2-09631-0 ("John Doe 1 Lawsuit"); (2) *John Doe 3, et al. v. Inspirit Athletics, Inc.,*
9 *et al.*, Pierce County Superior Court Case No. 23-2-050532-0 ("John Doe 3 Lawsuit"); (3) *Jane*
10 *Doe 20, as Guardian ad Litem for John Doe 20, et al. v. Inspirit Athletics, Inc., et al.*, Pierce
11 County Superior Court Case No. 23-2-08692-4 ("John Doe 20 Lawsuit").

12 2. Plaintiff ASIC's Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. 53) is GRANTED. The
13 Court finds and concludes that Plaintiff does not owe a duty to defend or duty to indemnify
14 Defendant Stacy Jackson for the claims asserted against her in the underlying lawsuit: *Jane Doe*
15 *20, as Guardian ad Litem for John Doe 20, et al. v. Inspirit Athletics, Inc., et al.*, Pierce County
16 Superior Court Case No. 23-2-08692-4 ("John Doe 20 Lawsuit").

17 3. The Court finds and concludes that Defendants Stacy Jackson, Inspirit Athletics,
18 Inc., John Doe 1, John Doe 2, Jane Doe 1, John Doe 3, John Doe 4, and Jane Doe 2 are bound by
19 this Court's Orders Granting Motions for Summary Judgment and holding that ASIC does not
20 owe a duty to defend or indemnify Jacob Jackson for the claims against him in the John Doe 1,
21 John Doe 3 or John Doe 20 Lawsuits. Dkts. 46 & 57.

22 4. The Court finds and concludes that Defendants Jacob Jackson, Inspirit Athletics,
23 Inc., John Doe 1, John Doe 2, Jane Doe 1, John Doe 3, John Doe 4, and Jane Doe 2 are bound by

1 this Court's Orders Granting Motions for Summary Judgment and holding that ASIC does not
2 owe a duty to defend or indemnify Stacy Jackson for the claims against her in the John Doe 20
3 Lawsuit. Dkts. 46 & 57.

4 5. The Court further directs the Clerk to enter a final Judgment for Plaintiff,
5 incorporating therein the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, finding that costs
6 of suit and attorney fees are not awarded, and closing the case.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 DATED this 24th day of February, 2025.

9
10 

11 ROBERT J. BRYAN
12 United States District Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23